

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Unice Hammond Williams,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Michael J. Astrue,

Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 1:11-1506-TLW-SVH

ORDER

Plaintiff has brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the defendant, Commissioner of Social Security, denying her claim for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 83.VII.02 (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and the case be remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative action as outlined in the Report. (Doc. # 31). The Report was filed on June 21, 2012. No objections have been filed.¹

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. No objections have been filed to the Report. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of

¹On July 6, 2012, defendant filed notice that it would not be filing any objections to the pending Report and Recommendation.

the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

A review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 31), and the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and the case is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner for further administrative action as outlined in the Report.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

July 12, 2012
Florence, South Carolina